

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/072,570	02/08/2002	Gijsbertus Johannes Van Oorschot	F7590(V)	1952
201 7	7590 11/14/2006		EXAMINER	
UNILEVER INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY GROUP			WEBMAN, EDWARD J	
700 SYLVAN BLDG C2 SOI	•		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
ENGLEWOOI	ENGLEWOOD CLIFFS, NJ 07632-3100			
			DATE MAILED: 11/14/200	6

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/072,570	VAN OORSCHOT ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Edward J. Webman	1616	
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim rill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE!	J. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>05 Seconds</u> 2a) This action is FINAL. 3) Since this application is in condition for allowant closed in accordance with the practice under Expression in the practice of the practice	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro		
Disposition of Claims		•	
4) Claim(s) 1-9,11-16,19-24 and 26-28 is/are pend 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-9 is/are withdrawn for 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 11-16,19-24 and 26-28 is/are rejected for claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or claim(s) are subjected to by the Examinet for the drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acceptable and 26-28 is/are rejected for claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or claim(s) are subjected to by the Examinet for claim(s) filed on is/are: a) acceptable filed	from consideration. r election requirement. r. epted or b) objected to by the E		
Applicant may not request that any objection to the or Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	ion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	s have been received. s have been received in Application ity documents have been received (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage	
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	ate	

Art Unit: 1616

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 11-16, 19-21, 23-24, 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Japan patent document JP-01277454 (JP-'454).

JP '454 (USPTO supplied English translation by Schreiber Translations, Inc. "USPTO" and applicant supplied translation "applicant") teaches that in China soybeans (USPTO p.3) or tofu (USPTO p. 5, applicant p.2) are mildewed (USPTO p.3, 5) or has mold grown thereon (applicant p.2). Monascus is disclosed (USPTO p.6 para.1, applicant p. 3 para. 6). As to the Hue a* value, statin, and amounts of polyphenols, the fungus and substrate are the same as those claimed, therefore the Hue a* value, statins and amount of polyphenols must be present in the anticipatory composition. As to the claimed meal replacer, the disclosed product is well-known as a meat substitute. Applicants argue that the translation is silent regarding the claimed statins, soy actives, and the claimed Hue a* value. However, all these limitations must be possessed by the anticipatory composition because it is the same as that claimed. Applicants argue that page 9 of their translation indicates a brownish color. However, page 9 is not of record. Page 13 of the USPTO translation discloses that the color is from a fermented product from Taiwan. Page 3 of the USPTO translation discloses that the Taiwan product is a result of fermentation with yeast. The translator's note on page 2 in applicants' translation indicates Aspergillis niger. However, China does not use this mold (USPTO p.6 para. 1, applicant p.3, para. 6).

Art Unit: 1616

Claims 11-16, 19-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for the Monascus species of fungi, does not reasonably provide enablement for any fungus. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make the invention commensurate in scope with these claims. On page 5 lines 5-18, the Monascus fungus is specified for obtaining the claimed composition. No other is disclosed.

Applicants argue that they disclose other fungi on page 2. However, although these fungi produce statins, applicants only disclose Monascus as producing a fermented product from soybeans with the claimed Hue a* value (specification page 15 line 11 et seq).

Claim 27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claim 27, "less than 0" is indefinite.

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting

Art Unit: 1616

ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 11-16, 19-24, 26-28 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-8 of U.S. Patent No. 6,849,281. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the instant claims encompass the patented claims regarding the particular polyphenols and statins and the patented claims encompass the instant claims regarding the presence of the statin producing fungus.

No claims allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Edward J. Webman whose telephone number is 571-272-0633. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F from 8 AM to 5 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, J. Richter, can be reached on 571-272-0646. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

Art Unit: 1616

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

EDWARD WEBMAN PRIMARY EXAMINER GROUNTSOO